

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-12, 14-25 and 42-50 remain in the application. Claims 12, 23 and 25 have been amended, and claims 42-50 have been added. Claim 13 and claims 26-41 drawn to a non-elected invention, have been cancelled.

#### **I. The Amendments**

Claim 12 has been amended to specify that the inorganic particles include colloidal silica. Claim 23 has been amended to specify that the water based adhesive is based on starch and claim 25 has been amended to indicate that the water based adhesive is based on starch.

New claims 42-45 are dependent from claim 6. Support for these new claims is found in original claim 6.

New claims 46 and 47 are dependent from claim 22 and specify the nature of the water-based adhesive. Support for these new claims is found in original claim 23.

New claims 48-50 are dependent from claim 24 and specify the nature of the water based adhesive. Support for these claims is found in original claim 25.

Entry of all of the above amendments is requested.

#### **II. The Rejections**

##### **(A) Claims 12, 23 and 25 have been rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph.**

The above claims have been rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. More particularly, the Examiner has indicated that these claims should each be rewritten using Markush language.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, has been overcome by the present amendments. Claim 12 has been amended to indicate that the inorganic particles include colloidal silica. Claim 23 has been amended to specify that the water-based adhesive is based on starch, and claim 25 has been amended to specify that the water-based adhesive is based on starch.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12, 23 and 25 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, are requested.

(B) Claims 23-25 are rejected on the grounds of non statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8, 20 and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,761,969 to Li et al in view of Dronzek '242.

The Examiner is requested to withdraw this rejection in view of the filing of the Terminal Disclaimer which accompanies this amendment.


### CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted in view of the above amendments and remarks, and the filing of the Terminal Disclaimer, that all of the claims under consideration in the present application satisfy the requirements of 35 USC §112 and are allowable in view of the filing of the Terminal Disclaimer. An early action allowing claims 1-12, 14-25 and 42-50 is solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with the filing of this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 18-0988 under Attorney Docket No. AVERP3331USA.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By   
Heidi A. Boehlefeld  
Reg. No. 34,296

1621 Euclid Avenue  
Nineteenth Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115  
(216) 621-1113